



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/414,526 10/08/99 KIM

Y SEC.637

JONES VOLENTINE LLP
12200 SUNRISE VALLEY DRIVE
RESTON VA 20191

IM22/1002

EXAMINER

CLEVELAND, M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1762

DATE MAILED:

10/02/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/414,526

Applicant(s)

Kim et al.

Examiner
Michael Cleveland

Group Art Unit
1762



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Aug 17, 2000

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) 10 and 12-14 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 11 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☒ The drawing(s) filed on Oct 8, 1999 is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☒ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☒ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 5

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 1762

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. Applicant's election of Group B in Paper No. 7 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)). The elected group reads on claims 1-9 and 11. Claims 10 and 12-14 are withdrawn from consideration.

Drawings

2. Figure 8 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g).
3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: 7 (in Fig. 5). Correction is required.

Specification

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Each Figure must be listed separately in the Brief Description of the Drawings (I.e. "Figures 1 through 4" should be Figures 1, 2, 3, and 4").

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

Art Unit: 1762

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

6. Claims 1, 3-9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Comizzoli et al. (U.S. Patent 5,851,849, hereafter '849).

'849 teaches loading a substrate into a reaction chamber (col. 6, lines 25-27);

purging with nitrogen at a temperature of 150-200 degrees C (col. 6, lines 27-28)

(Applicant states in the specification that the uniform termination is accomplished by purging the substrate with nitrogen at temperatures of 120-370 deg. C. Therefore, either the nitrogen purge step of Comizzoli inherently achieves such uniform termination or else the termination results from essential features which are not present in the claims.);

injecting trimethyl aluminum (TMA) as a first reactant into the chamber (col. 6, lines 29-38) (The trimethyl aluminum must inherently chemically adsorb in order to bond the aluminum to the substrate. Also, some trimethyl aluminum remains non-adsorbed (col. 6, lines 37-38). Therefore, there must some positive pressure in the chamber, and some physisorption of the trimethyl aluminum must take place.);

purging the chamber with nitrogen to remove non-adsorbed TMA (col. 6, lines 36-41) (which removes physisorbed trimethyl aluminum); and

forming a solid thin film of aluminum oxide by injecting water vapor into the chamber to react with the TMA (col. 6, lines 38-40).

Claim 3: A final purge inherently removes the by-products and any intermediates of the reaction (col. 6, lines 40-41).

Claim 4: The initial nitrogen purge may last several seconds to an hour. 1000 s was used as a concrete example (col. 6, lines 27-29). Such a purge may be viewed as four purges of 250 s each.

Art Unit: 1762

Claim 5: Applicant's specification reveals that the initial nitrogen purge of '849 must inherently uniformly terminate the surface with N atoms.

Claim 6: Part of the passivated surface (i.e., 41 of Fig. 5) is silicon (col. 5, lines 8-65; Fig. 5).

Claims 7, 9, and 11: The reactants are TMA and water and react to form the single atomic oxide, alumina, as discussed above.

Claim 8: Applicant's Table 1 reveals that inherently the bonding energy between Si and N is greater than that between Si and C (an atom from the methyl ligands of TMA).

7. Claims 1, 3, 6-7, 9, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kim et al. (Appl. Phys. Lett., 71, pp. 3604-3606, hereafter Kim).

Claims 1, 6-7, 9, and 11: Kim teaches loading a silicon substrate into a reaction chamber, cleaning to uniformly terminate the surface with atomic hydrogen, dosing with TMA, which inherently chemisorbs to the surface, purging with TMA, which inherently removes any physisorbed TMA, and injecting water to react with the TMA to form an alumina film (p. 3604).

Claim 3: A final purge inherently removes the by-products and any intermediates of the reaction (p. 3604, col. 2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. Claims 1-9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of '849.

Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, and 11: Kim teaches the steps described above, but does not teach an initial purge step or uniformly terminating the surface with an atom such as nitrogen.

'849 teaches that an ALD chamber may be purged with nitrogen before the ALD process of depositing alumina, as described above. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used such an initial nitrogen purge in the

Art Unit: 1762

process of Kim to have removed potential contaminants from the reaction chamber before the ALD process. Such a nitrogen treatment would inherently have terminated the silicon substrate with nitrogen atoms, as described by Applicant's specification.

Claim 2: Kim teaches that the substrate may be cleaned of a native oxide before being loaded into the chamber, but does not explicitly state that the cleaning step comes before loading the substrate into the chamber. However, it appears that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the cleaning step before loading the substrate into the ALD chamber in order to avoid damage to and contaminants in the ALD chamber by the HF used in the cleaning process.

Claim 4: The initial nitrogen purge may last several seconds to an hour. 1000 s was used as a concrete example (col. 6, lines 27-29). Such a purge may be viewed as four purges of 250 s each.

Claim 8: Applicant's Table 1 reveals that inherently the bonding energy between Si and N is greater than that between Si and C (an atom from the methyl ligands of TMA).

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Cleveland whose telephone number is (703)308-2331. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shrive Beck, can be reached at (703) 308-2333.



Michael Cleveland

September 26, 2000



Shrive Beck
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700